

Approved For Release 2004/04/15 : CIA-RDP83-00156R000300010077-0

transfer agreement between them or (in case the two institutions are under common control) by reason of a written undertaking by the person or body which controls them, there is reasonable assurance that—

"(1) transfer of patients will be effected between the hospital and the community mental health center whenever such transfer is medically appropriate as determined by the attending physician; and

"(2) there will be interchange of medical and other information necessary or useful in the care and treatment of individuals transferred between the institutions, or in determining whether such individuals can be adequately cared for otherwise than in either of such institutions.

Any community mental health center which does not have such agreement in effect, but which is found by a State agency (of the State in which such facility is situated) with which an agreement under section 1864 is in effect (or, in the case of a State in which no such agency has an agreement under section 1864, by the Secretary) to have attempted in good faith to enter into such an agreement with a hospital sufficiently close to the facility to make feasible the transfer between them of patients and the information referred to in paragraph (2), shall be considered to have such an agreement in effect if and for so long as such agency (or the Secretary, as the case may be) finds that to do so is in the public interest and essential to assuming extended care services for persons in the community who are eligible for payments with respect to such services under this title."

Sec. 5. (a) Section 1861(u) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting "community mental health center" after "health agency".

(b) Section 1861(w) of such Act is amended by inserting "community mental health center" after "nursing facility".

Sec. 6. (a) Section 1864(a) of such Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "or whether a facility therein is a community mental health center as defined in section 1861 (dd)" before the period at the end of the first sentence;

(2) by inserting "a community mental health center," after "rural health clinic," in the second sentence; and

(3) by inserting "community mental health center" after "laboratory," in the fifth sentence.

(b) Section 226(c)(1) of such Act is amended by inserting "and partial hospitalization services and outpatient services furnished by a community mental health center" before "(as such terms)" after "part C of Title XVIII."

(c) Section 7(d)(1) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 is amended by inserting "partial hospitalization services and outpatient services furnished by a community mental health center," after "inpatient hospital services."

(d) Section 1861(l) of such Act is amended by inserting "or community mental health center" after "nursing facility" each time it appears therein.

(e) Section 1832(a)(2)(B)(i) of such Act is amended by striking out "or" at the end of subclause (I), and by striking out "and" at the end of subclause (II), and inserting in lieu thereof "or", and by adding the following new subclause after subclause (II): "(III) a physician to a patient in a community mental health center; and".

By Mr. STAFFORD:

S. 459. A bill to authorize the Corps of Engineers to assist communities in the control of river ice; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

ICE FLOODING  
• Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. President, a seasonal problem afflicting many areas of our Nation might be termed "ice floods." When a sudden thaw follows a buildup in river ice, flooding is often produced by "ice dams" that accumulate at bridge abutments or other impediments in the river.

Ice flooding and ice damage occurs in many areas every winter. Last winter, there was a threat here in Washington to the bridges across the Potomac River from a buildup of ice. Such dangers from ice are likely to be even more severe with the coming of spring.

The danger of ice buildup can sometimes be handled effectively through the emergency work of the Corps of Engineers. Such a project was accomplished last winter at Montpelier, Vt. But these efforts often come too late; or may involve costly, last-minute activity using explosives.

I believe that, with systematic and coordinated planning, we can develop preventive methods for the control of river ice. I believe that we can and should successfully develop improved ice-breakup techniques, and to provide this information to affected communities. The Army Corps of Engineers is the proper organization to undertake this work.

To assist in that effort, my bill would strengthen the corps' ability to meet the ice-flooding problem. This legislation, I should point out, is nearly identical to legislation passed twice by the Senate last year. Its merits remain strong.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 459

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall undertake a program of research to increase his capability to control river ice, and to assist communities in breaking up such ice that would otherwise be likely to cause or aggravate flood damage or severe streambank erosion.*

SEC. 2. The Secretary is further authorized to provide technical assistance to local units of government to implement local plans to control or break up river ice. As part of such authority, the Secretary is authorized to acquire and loan necessary ice-control or ice-breakup equipment to local units of government.

SEC. 3. The sum of \$5,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary in each of the fiscal years ending September 30, 1980, September 30, 1981, and September 30, 1982, to implement this Act.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

S. 460. A bill to encourage bicycling and physical fitness by assuring greater safety for bicycles parked at Federal office buildings; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

BICYCLE SAFETY

• Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. President, I am today introducing legislation that is designed to assure that safe bicycle parking

facilities will be available at Federal office buildings across the Nation. I would hope that the availability of such facilities at Federal buildings would serve as a catalyst to encourage a similar expansion in bicycle parking facilities in the private sector.

A growing number of Americans are now bicycling to their jobs, despite many impediments to such travel. One major inhibition is unsafe traffic conditions. Last year's highway bill should ameliorate that situation. But the lack of safe and convenient parking facilities, and absence of areas where cyclists can change from cycling clothes and wash up at the end of their journey, serves as another factor inhibiting this form of commuting.

The General Services Administration now has a policy, it says, to provide "bicycle racks . . . where there is a demonstrated need." That appears to be a chicken-and-egg situation. Is a "demonstrated need" likely to exist if no racks are in place? Very likely not. The GSA has informed me that bicycle locking facilities are now available at only 438 GSA buildings, a small fraction of the buildings operated by GSA. This bill requires the installation of such facilities to enable the use to develop properly.

To the extent that encouraging cycling enables the public to substitute bicycles for private motor vehicles, we will modestly conserve energy and other resources, reduce traffic congestion, lessen air and noise pollution, increase physical fitness, and decrease the need for more and more parking garages.

To help overcome the lack of adequate bicycle parking facilities, this legislation directs the Administrator of the General Services Administration to provide, within 1 year, at all buildings and installations under his direction, bicycle parking facilities for use by employees and visitors. This would include buildings leased by the Federal Government, when they are under the direction of the GSA Administrator.

In the event the Administrator provides more than a simple rack for bicycle parking—a locker for example—this bill would authorize, but not require, that GSA charge a reasonable fee for the use of the device. The fee would be intended to be proportionate to the fee charged for motor-vehicle parking in connection with that building or installation. For example, if the Administrator charged a \$455 a month for auto parking, a reasonable parking fee might be something on the order of \$3 a month, if the bicycle locker takes up about one-fifteenth of the space needed for an automobile.

The Administrator should keep in mind the experience of the Environmental Protection Agency, where bicycle lockers are provided employees without charge. In deciding on the number and type of bicycle parking facilities and whether there should be user charges, the Administrator should consult beforehand with interested bicyclists working at the building or installation in question. The bill would also authorize the Ad-

ministrator to provide facilities where cyclists and others may shower and change clothes. The Administrator would also be authorized to charge a reasonable fee for the use of such facilities. Again, the Administrator would be expected to consult with interested persons in deciding upon such facilities.

The bill defines "bicycle parking facility" to make it clear that the minimum facility should be more than the standard rack, which is often inadequate for safely locking a bicycle. The Administrator should also alter the present restrictive GSA policy to permit the use of spaces such as courtyards, storage areas, or other areas where bicycle parking could be operated without interfering with normal use of the building. The most desirable facility would be one under guard or attendant; if parking for motor vehicles is provided under the surveillance of a guard or attendant, the GSA would be expected to provide protected bicycle parking for the same building or installation.

Mr. President, I introduced legislation very similar to this bill as S. 3621 in the 95th Congress. It was introduced at the end of the session to obtain comment from interested individuals and groups. Since the date I introduced S. 3621 last year, a new publication called *Bicycle Forum*, carried an article discussing the issue of bicycle parking. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from GSA, the text of the bill, and the article from *Bicycle Forum* be printed in the *Record*. There being no objection, the bill and material were ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

S. 460

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Administrator of the General Services Administration (hereafter referred to as the "Administrator"), within one year of the enactment of this Act, shall provide, at all buildings and installations under his direction, bicycle parking facilities for use by employees and visitors. Wherever the Administrator fulfills the requirement of this Act by use of a system that is more elaborate and costly than the use of a simple metal rack, he is permitted to charge a reasonable fee for the use of such system.*

*(b) The Administrator is also authorized, within a reasonable period and where feasible, to provide suitable support facilities, including clothing lockers and changing facilities, and to charge a reasonable use fee.*

*(c) For the purpose of this Act, the term "bicycle parking facility" means a device or an enclosure, located within a building or installation, or conveniently adjacent thereto, that is easily accessible, clearly visible to guards, well-lighted, and so located as to minimize the danger of theft of bicycles. Such a device shall consist of a parking rack, locker, or other device constructed to enable the frame and both wheels of a bicycle to be secured with ease by use of a padlock in a manner that will minimize the risk of theft.*

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,

Washington, D.C., October 4, 1978.

HON. ROBERT T. STAFFORD,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR STAFFORD: This is in further reply to your letter of August 21, 1978, regarding bicycle racks.

Approved For Release 2004/04/15 : CIA-RDP83-00156R000300010077-0

September 20, 1978, there were 438 buildings where bicycle locking facilities were provided by the General Services Administration (GSA). Of this number, there are a total of 14,407 parking spaces nationwide of which 4,218 (29 percent) are indoors or otherwise protected from the weather. There are a total of 2,108 spaces (14.6 percent) which we consider to be protected from theft. Each bicyclist is responsible for providing his or her own lock and chain or cable. We are presently experimenting with several makes of secure bicycle locking devices and lockers. During the year 1977, there were 37 bicycle thefts and 703 incidents of vandalism.

Thank you for your interest in this matter. If we can provide any additional information, please let us know.

Sincerely,

JAY SOLOMON,  
Administrator.

#### THE BICYCLE PARKING LINK

(By John J. Protopappas  
and Joseph Anderson)

(If bicycles could be more securely parked, their use would increase as a means of commuting, especially in connection with mass transit.)

The availability of secure bicycle storage is a prerequisite to any urban bicycle trip, yet there is a definite, pervasive deficiency in the amount and/or security of bicycle parking facilities throughout urban areas. Both the social, economic and environmental desirability of bicycling and the public's interest in bicycling are apparent. It is a stated policy or goal in many communities that "bicycling should be encouraged". To this end, many improvements to benefit bicycling have been studied and some have been implemented. Many bicycle paths and lanes have been constructed, but little attention has been paid to "incidentals" such as bicycle parking. Bicycle parking is an essential link in the chain of improvements that must be made to serve existing and potential bicycle users.

Why has bicycle parking, relatively easily and inexpensively implemented, fared so poorly in the "chain" of improvements? Most official public attention has focused on bicycle riding. Bicyclists have been competing for road space for years, raising the ire of motorists, precipitating reported accident statistics and expressing a certain amount of dissatisfaction with the inevitable traffic mix. Pressure has been brought from motorists and bicyclists alike for bikeway, education and enforcement programs. Bicycle parking, on the other hand, is a personal problem, one which raises little public sensitivity.

As slight as the public pressure for bicycle parking may be... the problem of securing a bicycle from theft is real and is shared by every individual bicyclist. This need can be met by public action and has the potential of being a substantial benefit and encouragement to the bicycling community.

An example of the magnitude of the problem was cited recently in a survey in the City of Baltimore. Based on survey data, 25 percent of the bicyclists had been victims of a bicycle theft and of these, 20 percent had given up bicycling. These facts are indicative of the problem which is commonly known in most American cities. The vulnerability and value of bicycles have made them attractive targets for theft. As the value and demand for bicycles have increased, the total number of bicycle thefts has also gone up.

A well thought-out and effectively executed bicycle parking program which appeals to both the implementors and the users is the answer to reducing bicycle theft and is a positive factor in encouraging bicycle use. In addition to implementing a program to provide adequate, secure bicycle

parking, serious attention should be given to a bicycle registration program and user education. These are complimentary elements. Mandatory registration is a logical means for identifying and returning stolen bicycles, for limiting resale potential, for providing a record of the magnitude of bicycle ownership and for discouraging theft from the outset. Education, as an instructive tool as well as a marketing element, should provide information on the building permit approval to include the provision of bicycle storage facilities.

Other policy considerations may be incorporated into codes and regulations to benefit bicycle security. For example, provisions for allowing bicycles on public transit vehicles or in the public areas of buildings and private offices can improve the bicyclists' mobility and/or avoid having to leave the bicycle unattended. The AC Transit and BART systems in San Francisco, the San Diego Transit Corporation and the New Jersey New York PATH system have all instituted forms of bicycle "carry-on" service.

#### BICYCLE STORAGE FACILITY TYPES AND DESIGN

The facets of design must be considered in providing bicycle parking area:

- 1) Degree of security and safety from vandalism and theft;
- 2) Location—convenience of parking relative to destination;
- 3) Weather protection (sun and rain).

Each factor elicits certain criteria which must be considered in determining what type of parking facility is best for the situation at hand. Bicycle storage needs may be differentiated between long-term parking and short-term or convenience parking. The distinction is similar to that for automobiles. The most important criterion for short-term convenience parking (shopping centers, libraries, post offices, etc.) is for the bicycle storage facility to be located immediately contiguous to the building entrance. For long-term/commuter parking (places of employment, apartment buildings, schools, transit stations, etc.) security from theft is the most critical consideration.

#### LOCATION

The closer bike parking is to a bicyclist's destination, the more likely it (and the bicycle) is to be used. "Many bikers, particularly those with more expensive machines, have such a case of theft paranoia (a not unreasonable affection) that they prefer not to be separated from their bikes at all and would blithely wheel into elevators, dentist's offices, bank lobbies and ice cream parlors if allowed to." Many people make it a practice to ask for space for their bicycle when first accepting a new job so there are no misunderstandings when they arrive at a new office with a 10-speed.

The point-to-point convenience of bicycle travel is undermined when parking is located in the far corner of a parking lot. It is best to locate a parking facility as near a building entrance as possible and (in high visibility areas) within the sight-lines of passersby. The location availability of parking, its proper use and practical theft preventive measures.

In designing a parking program, facilities must be selected to meet the need of bicyclists who are, in many cases, not involved in the decision making process. Three features must be considered: (1) incorporation of bicycle parking policy requirements into parking or zoning ordinances and local building codes, thus tying facilities into the public and private development process; (2) developing design standards to insure proper location, weather protection, equipment integrity and degree of security; and (3) budgeting funds for implementing public bicycle parking facilities. Each program must be

Footnotes at end of article.

tailored to local needs and resources. It may not be possible to successfully build public funds to construct parking, it may be possible to require private developers to provide adequate facilities in conjunction with new development.

#### BICYCLE PARKING ORDINANCES AND CODES

In order to insure that there is adequate space allocated for bicycle parking on an on-going basis, a bicycle parking ordinance may be formulated for incorporation into local zoning regulations. This is much like the typical regulations which require automobile parking spaces based on the square footage of building development.

A number of forward-looking communities have bicycle parking ordinances and a number of others have ordinances under consideration. One of the more notable of these is Palo Alto, California. In this city, developers are required, by Zoning Ordinance, to dedicate 5 percent of the total required parking space to secure bicycle storage facilities. This ordinance not only details what percentage of space must be dedicated to bicycle parking, but it goes on to define what type of storage facility (Class I, II or III) must be provided.<sup>3</sup>

Another jurisdiction, Montgomery County, Maryland, updated off-street parking space requirements in the Zoning Ordinance to incorporate compact car, bicycle, handicap, and motorcycle spaces. The ordinance stipulates that all owners of parking facilities containing more than 40 parking spaces must provide 1 bicycle parking space or locker for each 20 automobile parking spaces. Not more than 20 bicycle parking stalls or lockers are required on any one lot. It further states, "... Bicycle parking facilities shall be so located as to be safe from motor vehicle traffic and secure from theft. Interior storage and lockers are encouraged. They shall be properly repaired and maintained. Facilities that are used for overnight parking must be protected from the weather when they are part of an enclosed parking facility." Owners of existing parking facilities who take advantage of the space savings of compact car layout must also abide by the requirement for bicycle parking facilities. This ordinance revision reduces the amount of land necessary for parking facilities, making more efficient use of existing space. Other jurisdictions, such as Arlington County, Virginia, have rewritten guidelines for subdivision and yield satisfactory results. A good variety of locking and parking devices currently exists but careful selection is still necessary. Three categories of bicycle parking devices according to degree of security, have been suggested.<sup>4</sup>

**Class I:** Lockers or controlled access areas where bicycles may be stored, protected from theft, weather, and vandalism.

**Class II:** Devices which lock the bicycle frame and wheels, secured from theft of the unit. The individual may have to provide a padlock.

**Class III:** Bicycle racks or fixed objects to which a bicycle may be secured by the individual's own locking device.

**Class III or "bicycle racks"** are the traditional and currently predominant facility for bicycle parking. It is left to the bicyclists to shoulder the responsibility for protecting their investment by buying and using lock sets. Unfortunately, the value and theft experience of today's bicycle has outmoded this approach.

Independent tests conducted across the country confirm that there are no really secure bike lock hardware systems in this class. Some locks carried by cyclists are better than others, but in a high crime setting, none would last longer than 10 minutes; in fact most will give way to under two minutes according to the *Consumer Report*.<sup>5</sup> Another

testing report confirms that no lock will last longer than two minutes.<sup>7</sup> In the words of one lock manufacturer, a bicycle lock will delay a thief momentarily, but "... if somebody sees a \$150 bicycle and plans to get it, it is his. Basically what you're protecting against is the chance thief or opportunist." Though suitable for short-term convenience parking, long-term parking requires more than a system which provides only a moral deterrent.

Class II bicycle parking devices are designed to secure the bicycle frame and wheels in an upright position, typically by a post and chain construction. Accessory parts of the bicycle, such as the seat, air pump, tool kits, are not protected. Weather protection may be provided by a special structure or by selecting a location under an existing overhang. Different locking mechanisms are available: coin operated, key-operated or the bicyclist's own padlock. The locking mechanism is an important consideration. Key or coin operated equipment costs twice as much initially, requires more maintenance, and necessitates a user charge.

Generally, the padlock systems are most popular. The added costs of the other systems cannot be justified unless it is imperative that revenue be collected or tourists without padlocks are the anticipated users. Transit systems which have utilized the Class II devices include: Marta in Atlanta, Seattle's Transit System, Bart in San Francisco, Path in New York-New Jersey, Patco in Pennsylvania-New Jersey. Many universities have also installed these parking devices.

Table A lists the various manufacturers of secure parking devices. (Class I and II) including products and approximate prices. The prices range from \$25 to \$250 per parked bicycle. Class II devices have been tested by two independent investigators. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Research Center, Philadelphia and the University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland.

The University of Maryland Planning Department made an in use study of eight of the Class I and II bicycle racks available today.<sup>6</sup> Table B summarizes test results. As these results indicate, no rack is perfect. Each rack has its pros and cons. The use intended, site location, and economics will define which rack will serve a particular situation better than another. The University of Maryland set up the following criteria and then made their choice after testing eight racks over a year's time.

#### WEATHER PROTECTION

Protecting the bicycle from the elements—sun and rain—is particularly important for long-term/commuter parking. For trips with a shorter parking duration, such as shopping and other personal business, open air parking may be acceptable. These trips are generally more flexible in schedule and may be delayed to a better time or day. It is best, however, under any circumstances, to utilize a location that already provides weather protection, if otherwise suitable. For long-term parking in particular, consideration must be given to protection by awnings, canopies, interior spaces or lockers (where warranted for theft protection).

#### SECURITY & SAFETY

Protection from theft is the individual's primary concern when leaving the bicycle unattended. Procuring the ultimate security parking device has been the relentless pursuit of many manufacturers. Separate attempts by both BART in San Francisco and Metro in Washington, D.C. to specify custom-made bicycle lockers failed to produce cost-effective equipment.

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Research Center tested three Class II devices considering security, ease of operation, versatility (to accept locks), and aesthetics. All models

reported superior to traditional bike rack lock set security when subjected to most methods of attack. Three high security locking devices were tested for compatibility with each parking device. Results are summarized on Table C. Economics were not a consideration in the ranking; the top rated Rack III unit costs \$10 to \$15 more than other units, a small difference relative to the average personal investment in a bicycle.<sup>8</sup>

Class I, bike lockers or storage spaces, are a significant, important step forward in protecting bicycles. They afford virtually complete protection from theft, vandalism and weather. There are two approaches: a locker unit similar to baggage storage lockers and controlled storage areas which are attended or accessible only by keys held by a limited number of individuals or responsible.

In urban areas with attended parking garages or lots, areas can be adapted to store bicycles with relative ease, although without mandates or enforced ordinances, garages are reluctant to do so. In Washington, D.C., where some of the private parking garages installed bike racks, the same fees as charged to automobiles were levied against the cyclists. This parking program was not well received by bicyclists. A good example of controlled storage area is found in Union Station, the Amtrak & commuter rail terminal in Washington, D.C. A caged area for bicycle storage is provided inside the station, administered and maintained by the National Park Service. For a small initiation fee, bicyclists obtain a key to the storage area. Most of the bike/rail commuters use the storage for overnight parking, using their bicycles for the work trip end of their commute.

Standard bicycle lockers are currently available from three manufacturers (Table A) ranging in price from about \$160 to \$250 per bicycle stored. Construction is either steel or aluminum and fiberboard and all units are wedge-shaped, allowing a variety of layout patterns—circular and rectangular (back-to-back). Although little data is available, one source notes that no successful thefts have occurred at either Bart or Southern California Rapid Transit District installations.

Lockers can be coin operated, locked by separate padlock, or a cyclist can be issued a key on a lease basis. The latter system is used in Washington, D.C. and San Francisco where lockers have been installed at several of the new rail transit stations.

The first ten lockers installed at Metro's Silver Spring Station were offered for lease for variable period rates to \$70 per year. All lockers were leased for a full year prior to the station's opening day (without the benefit of advertising). Although the \$70 per year fee was regarded as high, the public's response indicates a high demand for this type of facility.

Based on an installed cost of \$320 per double locker unit, the Metro locker rentals will cover the capital investment in two and one-half years. Since all the lockers were leased for a full year the first day offered, almost half of the capital cost was covered immediately after installation. With demonstrated high demand, 16 more lockers have been ordered for the Silver Spring Station and the District of Columbia has 250 on order to be installed at stations throughout the city.

The Bart system in San Francisco has a relatively long-standing experience with lockers. Bart planners indicate that the initial installation of 60 lockers throughout the system would have been recommended for increase if based on current experiences. It is believed that the initially inadequate supply of bike racks and lockers has been a deterrent to many potential bicycle users. In response to demand, 648 additional lockers are in the process of being installed. At first Bart offered

Footnotes at end of article.



Approved For Release 2004/04/15 : CIA-RDP83-00156R000300010077-0

lockers at 25¢ per day or on a lease basis for \$5 per month. Daily coin rental has since been abandoned in favor of a wholly leased system. "Leasing is preferred among regular bike commuters because it guarantees a place in a locker, which are available in limited numbers." As stated earlier, both Bart and Metro also include Class II parking devices in their parking programs which are free of charge and well-utilized.

## THE FUTURE

There are many signs that the future looks bright for the bicycle commuter. The Federal government allows federal highway monies and transit capital funds to be spent on bicycle facilities including parking.\* Local governments including the traffic engineers, architects, and planners are recognizing the needs of the cyclists. With the proper amount of interest and forethought

by these people we can hope to see a continuation of the trend toward installing first class bicycle parking facilities. The first step is establishing the need for parking and making a specific proposal. Bike parking is easy, simple, and inexpensive to implement relative to many other improvements being considered to enhance bicycling. With initiative, care and thought, very high quality parking can be provided to the benefit of user and community alike.

## FOOTNOTES

\*Traffic Engineering, Vol. 47, No. 3, March 1977.

\*Baltimore County Bikeways Task Force, "Bicycling Parking, a Design Manual", January 1976.

\*City of Palo Alto, "Zoning Regulations", adopted March 20, 1978. Sections 18.83.040 through 18.83.070.

\*Skrabek, Darryl, "Bike Law", Bicycling Magazine, March 1975.

\*Baltimore Bicycling Parking Manual.

\*"Bike Lock Sets", Consumer Reports, November 1975.

\*"Most bicycle locks yield to thieves in seconds", The Minneapolis Star, August 5, 1974.

\*The Minneapolis Star, August 5, 1974.

\*"UMCP Bicycle Parking—Stage Two", Department of Physical Plant, Office of Plans, Programs and Campus Development, University of Maryland, April 14, 1976.

\*"Bicycle Parking: Tests of Parking Racks", Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Research Center, Philadelphia, Penn. 1976.

\*Skrabek, Darryl, "Bike Law", Bicycling Magazine, March 1975.

\*See Federal Funds for Bicycles, this issue.

TABLE A.—AVAILABLE BICYCLE STORAGE FACILITY TYPES

Name of device and manufacturer (City, State)	Class	Model	Price (each)	Notes	Name of device and manufacturer (City, State)	Class	Model	Price (each)	Notes
1. Rack III: Rack III, 1714 Stockton St., San Francisco, Calif.	II	Key Coin-op	\$120.00	Used at many locations throughout United States. Each rack holds 1 bicycle.	6. Bike Lock Up: Howard Enterprises, 1250 Wilson Way, Stockton, Calif.	II	Standard Deluxe	31.00 33.00	Do. Installed University of Maryland.
2. Rally Rack: Rally Enterprises, Inc., Box 299, Sonoma, Calif. (minimum order: 6).	II	Padlock RR-100	41.75 22.00	Each rack holds one bicycle. Used by PATH system (NY-NJ) at Journal Sq. Transportation Center.	7. Park-A-Bike: Park-A-Bike Systems, 180 Coor St., Suite 111, Denver, Colo.	II		25.00 75.00	Holds 1 bicycle. Installed University of Maryland.
	II	RR-200	25.00	Used by WMATA (District of Columbia) at present and future stations.	8. U-Lok: Sunshine Recreation Co., 22713 Ventura Blvd., Suite A, Woodland, Calif.	II	Security stand	45.00	Holds 2 bicycles; installed at various colleges, special lock option.
	II	RR-300	55.00	PATCO (PA-IN) installing 171 RR-300's.	9. Bike Root: Bike Rack: The Bike Root Co., 311 1/2 Mount Vernon St., Charlestown, Mass.	II		28.50	Holds 1 bicycle.
3. Cycle-Sentry: Senter Industries, P.O. Box 4043, San Francisco, Calif.	II	RR-400	160.00	Key-coin operated.	10. Bike Lokr: Bike Lockers, P.O. Box 978, North Highlands, Calif.	I	Padlock Coin-op	320.00 320.00	2 bicycles per locker; installed by BART, EPA, Metro Maryland.
4. Bike Safe: Patterson-Williams, P.O. Box 4040, Santa Clara, Calif.	II	Galvanized Painted	35.00 39.00	Each rack holds 1 bicycle.	11. Bike Stable: Bike Stable Co., P.O. Box 1402, South Bend, Ind.	I	Key-op	214.00	Holds 1 bicycle. No units have been sold up to this date.
5. Bala-Byk, Lok-Rak: Bala-Byk-Lok-Rak, 691 Parkview Circle, Pacifica, Calif.	II	Padlock Coin-op	31.50 65.50	Installed at University of Maryland. Each rack holds 1 bicycle.	12. Mac Cycle Vault: BMR Fabrications, P.O. Box 610, Toccoa, Ga.	I	Padlock Coin-op	194.00 250.00	1 bicycle per locker, Do.

TABLE B.—UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND RACK COMPARISON

## TRADE NAME, ADVANTAGES, AND DISADVANTAGES

## Rally Rack RR-100

## ADVANTAGES

Secures rear wheel and frame with a single lock; Rack consists of a single post and has no moving parts; Rack is very easy to use; Rack has aesthetic appeal by virtue of its good design.

## DISADVANTAGE

Does not secure the front wheel.

## Rally Rack RR-200

## ADVANTAGE

Rack has the advantages of the RR-100 with the addition of a cable attached to the post which secures the front wheel.

## Rally Rack RR-300

## ADVANTAGE

Rack has the advantages of the RR-100 with the addition of a formed steel plate which prevents removal of the front wheel.

## DISADVANTAGE

Cost is more than twice that of the Rally Rack RR-200.

## Standard Rack

## ADVANTAGE

Least expensive of all rack systems.

## DISADVANTAGES

Provides the least security of all rack systems, requiring an unusually long chain or cable supplied by the user to secure both wheels and frame of a bike making it vul-

nerable to bolt or wire cutters; Bikes parked in these racks are easily damaged; Rack design encourages inefficient and cluttered parking arrangement.

## Bala Byk-Lok Rak

## ADVANTAGES

Secures both wheels and frame with a single lock;

All locking components are constructed of steel.

## DISADVANTAGES

Poorly constructed—welds break with normal use;

Not easy to use—requires four steps to secure bike;

Does not provide arrangement flexibility; Visually clutters the environment—has no aesthetic appeal; Rusts over time.

## Howard Bike Lockup

## ADVANTAGE

Secures both wheels and frame with a single lock.

## DISADVANTAGES

Disadvantages are identical to those listed for the Bala Byk-Lok Rak.

## Park-A-Bike

## ADVANTAGES

Secures both wheels and frame with a single lock.

Relatively easy to use.

## DISADVANTAGES

Visually clutters the environment—has no aesthetic appeal;

Cable which secures both wheels may be vulnerable to bolt or wire cutters.

## Rack III

## ADVANTAGES

Secures both wheels and frame with a single lock;

All locking components are constructed of steel.

## DISADVANTAGE

Secures bicycles with a pivoting three-pronged device—this moving part may prove troublesome.

## UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND PLANNING DEPARTMENT BICYCLE RACK CRITERIA

The rack must secure both wheels and the bicycle frame.

Securing the bicycle in the rack is to be a simple operation.

The rack is to accommodate a wide range of bicycle types and locking mechanisms.

Securing the bike must be possible with only a user-supplied lock.

Although data is not available on durability, racks should be selected for their apparent quality. Members and joints should be rustproof and designed to minimize or eliminate structural and mechanical failures.

The appearance of the rack is to be "aesthetically pleasing" within the financial and functional parameters.

The rack design is to allow for flexibility in site development.

While racks must be capable of being securely anchored, the ability to relocate them is an option to be considered.

The final University of Maryland report

states that . . . "Research has determined that the Rally Rack Models RR-200 and RR-300 are superior to all other manufacturers in meeting the established criteria."

Table C.—Test results  
(Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Research Center)

Rack	Rack III	Rally Rack 200	Bala Byk-a-Lok-Rak
Security	second	third	first
Ease of Operation	first	second	third
Versatility	first	third	second
Aesthetic Quality	first	second	third

By Mr. STAFFORD:

S. 461. A bill to require that competitions be conducted to enhance the Nation's architecture and determine the design of certain new Federal office buildings; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

#### ARCHITECTURAL EXCELLENCE ACT OF 1979

• Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. President, last year I introduced S. 2402, legislation to require that architectural competition be held in the design of larger buildings of the General Services Administration. I am today reintroducing similar legislation, in the expectation that it can be considered in the context of the GSA reforms that need to be undertaken by the Congress.

The Architectural Excellence Act of 1979 is legislation intended to foster improvements in the architectural design of new Federal office buildings. The United States, in one recent year, spent \$140,000,000 in architectural fees on 3,400 projects of the GSA and other agencies. Surely, we can set aside a small portion of that expenditure in a search for greater architectural innovation and excellence.

The architectural critic, Wolf Von Eckhardt, testified to our committee that "practically all the best buildings in the world have been the result of competition." Let me cite just a few of the better known ones: The White House, the U.S. Capitol, the New York Public Library, the State Capitols of Missouri and Washington, the Houses of Parliament in London, the new Coventry Cathedral in England, the Boston City Hall, the Cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York, and the Sydney Opera House in Australia. Many of these buildings are structures for the ages, structures deserving worldwide attention. I do not claim that this bill would necessarily produce such exciting and important buildings. But I do believe it will create a better atmosphere for architectural innovation and excitement.

Federal buildings now built often appear to be cut from molds, with little imagination or recognition of what we hope are the lofty ideals upon which our Government stands. Contrast that with the view early in this century, when one Member of Congress said: "No youth or citizen ever looked upon a Federal building in which the business of his country was being conducted but that he became a better American."

Seven years ago, the Congress added what I believe was the first requirement that GSA assure architectural excellence in its new designs. But testimony before the Committee on Environment and Pub-

lic Works has shown little impact from that directive. In 1976, the Congress enacted an important new initiative in the area of public buildings policy. This was the Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act (Public Law 94-541). I was pleased to be a sponsor of that law, which encourages the Federal Government to acquire and preserve buildings of historic or cultural importance, converting the space into new Federal offices. Flexibility of this nature should improve our Federal buildings program, making the Federal Government a better neighbor.

We can and we should utilize the Federal building policy as an innovative tool in architectural design for new buildings. Such policy would serve to encourage new, young architects, giving them opportunities they may not otherwise obtain for years.

I recognize that such an approach may not be a popular one among some architects. But it is working elsewhere. The British Government is using competitions wisely. And my approach involves a very limited first step. It would mandate competitions on each Federal building project that is expected to cost \$25,000,000 or more. That figure is an arbitrary one, I admit. But it is designed to test the concept, and thus should be a valid starting point.

My bill would set aside between one-half of 1 percent and 1 percent of the cost of the building to be used to run the competition, with the prize limited to a maximum of \$250,000. These figures, too, are arbitrary. But I would hope that we will obtain testimony on how a more valid figure can be established, if this one is considered to be inappropriate. The actual architectural fee, of course, would then be negotiated as if the winner were selected as the most qualified applicant, under the normal procedure.

Mr. President, this bill also requires that all the proceedings of the panel of judges be held in public so that the public and local community officials can observe and participate.

I believe that this approach merits the support of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 461

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Architectural Excellence Act of 1979".

Sec. 2. The Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, is amended further by insert-

ing a new section 8 as follows, and renumbering subsequent sections accordingly:

"Sec. 8. (a) (1) Whenever the Administrator is authorized under the terms of this Act to construct a public building at a cost that is estimated to be in excess of \$25,000,000, the Administrator shall set aside a sum of not less than one-half of 1 per centum or greater than 1 per centum of the estimated cost of such public building to finance a competition for determining the design of such public building. Such competition should stress innovative designs that will be compatible with the community, conserve energy and materials, encourage public use of and access to the building, and reflect the dignity, enterprise, vigor, and stability of the Government of the United States.

"(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Administrator may conduct a competition for determining the design of any building which he is authorized to construct; Provided, That not greater than 1 per centum of the estimated cost of such project is utilized for such competition.

"(b) The Administrator shall establish the prize to be awarded to the winner of each competition under this section in accordance with the scope of each project, but in no event shall such prize exceed \$250,000.

"(c) To determine the most appropriate design under the terms of this section, the Administrator shall appoint a panel of five persons. Such panel shall be composed of an architect who shall not be associated with any entrant in the competition and who shall serve as chairman, a representative of the municipality in which such building will be constructed, a nominee of the National Endowment of the Arts, an architectural educator or critic, and a representative of the Administrator. Meetings of such a panel shall be open to the public, and the decision of such panel shall be final. The winner selected by the panel shall be considered as the 'highest qualified firm' for the purposes of section 904 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of

"(d) The requirements of this section include any public building, whether owned initially by the United States or to be so owned as part of a long-term financing arrangement, or to any public building constructed specifically for the United States under a lease arrangement.

"(e) For the purposes of this section, the word 'design' includes the general architectural appearance and general engineering of a public building, together with such information as will be reasonably required to provide detailed architectural and engineering plans and specifications for such public building."

By Mr. WEICKER:

S. 462. A bill to exempt the price of natural gas imported from Mexico from regulation under any Federal or State law; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

#### NATURAL GAS FROM MEXICO

• Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill that will exempt the price of natural gas imported from Mexico from regulation under any Federal or State law.

The effect of this proposal will be to remove from the executive branch of Government the power to approve or disapprove contracts made by American businesses for the importation of Mexican natural gas.

For too long this administration has failed to develop a coherent national energy policy and has repeatedly flipped-